

## Appendix 4

# RFP NO. CWB-PRC 14-01 EVALUATION CRITERIA WORKSHEET

Applicant:	Hanalei Watershed Hui	
Project Title:	Cesspool Assessment/Replacement	
Grant Funds Requested:	\$697,154.29	
Match Funds Provided:	\$533,173.68	
Total Project Cost:	\$1,230,327.97	Reviewed By: Yin

125 Total Points	
Each of the categories will be scored based upon how the proposal addresses priority implementation projects, the clarity and quality of the information provided that information correlates with the water quality goals of the grant and the CWB's mission.	

No.	Category
1.	<b>Overview:</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Briefly describe the activities to be funded</li> <li>Show how the proposed project will address nonpoint source pollution</li> <li>Briefly explain how the proposed project will achieve water quality improvements</li> </ul>

<b>Overview Subtotal:</b>	
Comments:	cannot quantify anticipated results given locations have not yet been identified. Does not commit to number of replacements, only "targets" and budgets for 27 replacements.

2.	<b>Project Site Description:</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Include a description of the project area, land owners, land cover, physical features and other information</li> <li>Adequately explain why the location for the project was chosen</li> <li>Include a clear and legible map of the project area</li> </ul>
----	---

<b>Project Site Description Subtotal:</b>	
Comments:	unclear in map which properties would be targeted by the program.

3.	<b>WBP or TMDL Implementation Plan Context:</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Identify the project listed in Section 1.3 or in an effective WBP on the island of Kauai</li> <li>&lt;OR&gt; Identify a specific proposed implementation project from a Table 1 WBP or TMDL Implementation Plan</li> <li>Adequately show that the proposed project is a priority per the respective WBP or TMDL Implementation Plan</li> </ul>
----	---

<b>WBP or TMDL Implementation Plan Context Subtotal:</b>	
Comments:	clearly identified as priority in WBP. Plan was specific to rental properties, requiring further assessment work for owner occupied. Proposal could have better illustrated the number of cesspools, feet of waterbody etc. The information exists, unclear why signif assess is still needed. Pre- assessment work is unnecessary. Any 15 in HT w/i 750 would implement goals of plan.

4.	<b>Scope of Services:</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Provide a detailed scope of services that adequately identifies and outlines the proposed activities</li> <li>Adequately describe in detail all tasks that are necessary to complete the project</li> <li>Clearly link the proposed tasks or activities to the overall project purpose</li> <li>Adequately describe how the tasks will be planned, managed, monitored, and completed</li> <li>Identify appropriate project deliverables</li> <li>Address any permitting requirements, property access permissions, and other applicable bottlenecks</li> <li>If a continuation of an existing project, show past successes and link to the proposed follow-up project</li> </ul>
----	---

<b>Scope of Services Subtotal:</b>	
Comments:	proposal needs to clarify additional steps necessary. Does not adequately describe the challenge/ ease of getting property owners on board. Proposal does not commit to number of replacement cesspools. "conference" will be attended, the audience of those confs etc. Is this necessary? SDS needs more detail if to be funded. Interim steps to ensure project is on track, what happens if less than 15 in HT w/i 750 would implement goals of plan.

conferences will be attended, the audience of these calls etc. Is this necessary? SOS needs more detail if to be funded - interim steps to ensure project is on task. what happens if less are

5.	Anticipated Outcomes: <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>Identify which pollutant(s) will be addressed</li><li>Clearly explain how the proposed project will reduce the identified pollutants and improve water quality</li></ul>
----	--

5.	Anticipated Outcomes (Continued): <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>Provide estimates of current loads and anticipated reductions as a result of project installation</li><li>Explain how load reduction estimates were calculated</li><li>Provide a detailed description of how the anticipated outcomes meet water quality goals per the respective WBP</li></ul>
----	---

Anticipated Outcomes Subtotal:

Comments: unclear if data exist to link cesspools to wq impairments/ pollutant loads. Proposal does good job of showing effectiveness to treatment method but falls short because the number of replacement units are not secured, difficult to assess the anticipated effectiveness of the implementations. proposal does not provide context of anticipated load reduction with the impairment waterbody.

6.	Project Monitoring: <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>Adequately describe the approach for monitoring pre- and post-project installation conditions</li></ul>
----	---

Effectiveness Monitoring Subtotal:

Comments: need to ID implementation milestones to ensure project on task. NTP lacks "landowner agreements" milestones. Unclear if the groundwater sampling is necessary - do we have information on groundwater? Proposal does not discuss relevance. assessment work not necessary.

7.	Education and Outreach: <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>Briefly describe the strategy and activities planned to educate and involve the public</li><li>Are the strategies and activities listed adequate for successful public outreach?</li></ul>
----	--

Education and Outreach Subtotal:

Comments: outreach and obtaining land owner agreements needs to be expanded.

8.	Personnel and Partners: <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>Are the project manager and contact person identified and include relevant background information?</li><li>Identify key partners who will adequately assist in the successful completion of the activities proposed</li><li>Include contact information, as well as a brief statement, of the role or contribution of all partners</li><li>Include appropriate letters of support from partner organizations</li></ul>
----	--

Personnel and Partners Subtotal:

Comments: proposal should identify if there are contractors on island with the technical ability to install EC systems.

9.	Budget: <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>Clearly delineate costs to be met by the grant and matching funds</li><li>Include clear descriptions of cost categories and provide sufficient justification for costs</li></ul>
----	--

Budget Subtotal:

Comments: unclear distribution of costs for EC units in budget - grant funds vs match. What is "investment" vs. Owner? How much does one EC cost? How much does installation/ construction contract for less than 27 units are replaced? Are Envirocycles necessary? so much more beneficial than ATU? justification. Budget is not reasonable given unknown for number of units funded. need to per property break down of cost (unit, engineering, installation etc).

10.	Schedule of Activities: <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Include a schedule of activities that adequately outlines all deliverables described in the Scope of Services</li></ul>	
-----	---	--

Schedule of Activities Subtotal:

Comments: steps missing. See comments above.

TOTAL SCORE:

Actual points awarded will follow these general ranges:

- Fully Addressed Criteria: 22-25 points for 25 point criteria; 18-20 points for 20; 9-10 points for 10; 9 points for 9; 5 points for 5
- Partially Addressed Criteria: 8-21 points for 25 point criteria; 6-17 points for 20; 3-8 points for 10; 3-8 points for 9; 2-4 points for 5
- Criteria Not Addressed: 0-7 points for 25 point criteria; 0-5 points for 20; 0-2 points for 10; 0-2 points for 9; 0-1 point for 5

vided, and how

Points

- 1 of 1
- 1 of 2
- 1 of 2
- 3 of 5

- 1 of 1
- 2 of 3
- 1 of 1
- 4 of 5

- 8 of 10
- of 1
- 4 of 5
- 12 of 15

ools located within 750

- 3 of 5
- 1 of 3
- 6 of 8
- 2 of 4
- 1 of 2
- 0 of 2
- 0 of 1
- 13 of 25

ements. Unclear what  
in 27 units replaced?

all 27 units replaced?

2 of 3  
7 of 9

2 of 5  
2 of 5  
2 of 3

15 of 25

gements is not committed.  
ent of the watershed/

2 of 5  
2 of 5

about contam of the

3 of 5  
3 of 5  
6 of 10

1 of 2  
1 of 3  
2 of 3  
2 of 2  
6 of 10

5 of 10  
3 of 10  
8 of 20

tor cost? What happens if  
better articulate the cost

3

of 5

3

of 5

72

of 125

Yin, Christina

---

From: Yin, Christina  
Sent: Thursday, March 19, 2015 6:24 PM  
To: Burke, Michael; Iwashita, Darcey; Takeshima, Greg; Randee Tubul  
([Randee.Tubal@doh.hawaii.gov](mailto:Randee.Tubal@doh.hawaii.gov))  
Cc: Slay, Hudson  
Subject: Yin BAFO Score Sheet  
Attachments: Yin BAFO Score Sheet RFP No CWB-PRC 14-01.xlsx

PRC – thanks for a productive and enlightening call today! At the end of the day, I think we did good work.

My BAFO scores are attached (incidentally, being sent to you at the end of MY day.).

Tina

Yin, Christina

---

From: Burke, Michael <[Michael.Burke@doh.hawaii.gov](mailto:Michael.Burke@doh.hawaii.gov)>  
Sent: Monday, February 23, 2015 5:23 PM  
To: Yin, Christina; Slay, Hudson; Iwashita, Darcey; Takeshima, Greg; Tubal, Randee  
Subject: RE: BAFO Schedule & Envirocycle Information

I just emailed Matt to see if Stacy can participate in the call too.  
I'll let you know what I hear.

Mike

---

**From:** Yin, Christina [<mailto:Yin.Christina@epa.gov>]  
**Sent:** Monday, February 23, 2015 3:19 PM  
**To:** Burke, Michael; Slay, Hudson; Iwashita, Darcey; Takeshima, Greg; Tubal, Randee  
**Subject:** RE: BAFO Schedule & Envirocycle Information

OK – well, I can see this might be unorthodox – if he is contact person for the org, then he would not be a subcontractor....

Either way, if the funds are to be encumbered to the Waipa Foundation, it's important, and our due diligence, to have Waipa Foundation person on the phone as well. Especially since it now becomes clear to me the "ownership" of the project really needs to be the contractor, not just the sub.

Just as we would expect Hanalei Hui to bring their sub-contractor to the BAFO call. Right?

Tina

Tina Yin, Regional Nonpoint Source Pollution Coordinator  
US EPA Region 9  
75 Hawthorne Street, WTR 2-2  
San Francisco, CA 94105  
Phone: 415-972-3579  
[yin.christina@epa.gov](mailto:yin.christina@epa.gov)

---

**From:** Burke, Michael [<mailto:Michael.Burke@doh.hawaii.gov>]  
**Sent:** Monday, February 23, 2015 5:08 PM  
**To:** Slay, Hudson; Iwashita, Darcey; Takeshima, Greg; Tubal, Randee; Yin, Christina  
**Subject:** RE: BAFO Schedule & Envirocycle Information

No, Matt is the POC per their proposal.

---

**From:** Slay, Hudson [<mailto:SLAY.HUDSON@EPA.GOV>]  
**Sent:** Monday, February 23, 2015 3:10 PM  
**To:** Burke, Michael; Iwashita, Darcey; Takeshima, Greg; Tubal, Randee; Yin, Christina  
**Subject:** RE: BAFO Schedule & Envirocycle Information

Mike,



Shouldn't we be talking to Stacey Sproat about the Waipa Foundation proposal (since she is the director) rather than Matt Rosener who would be a contractor for the project (but doesn't necessarily represent the Waipa Foundation)? If the Waipa Foundation wants Matt to join the conversation then that seems fine but I think we should be directing the conversation to the potential contractor.

Thanks,  
Hudson

---

From: Burke, Michael [<mailto:Michael.Burke@doh.hawaii.gov>]

Sent: Monday, February 23, 2015 2:57 PM

To: Iwashita, Darcey; [greg.takeshima@doh.hawaii.gov](mailto:greg.takeshima@doh.hawaii.gov); [Randee.Tubal@doh.hawaii.gov](mailto:Randee.Tubal@doh.hawaii.gov); Slay, Hudson; Yin, Christina

Subject: BAFO Schedule & Envirocycle Information

To date, both Todd Cullison (Hui o Ko'olaupoko) and Matt Rosener (Waipa Foundation) have replied to meet with us for the BAFO conversations. We'll meet with Todd at 11am (HST) and conference call with Matt at 1pm (HST) on Wednesday. Maka'ala hasn't responded, but she's penciled in for 215pm (HST). I'll let everyone know if she replies to the email I sent her last week.

I spoke with Mark Tomomitsu from the Wastewater Branch about Envirocycle ATUs and their effectiveness. According to Mark, there are three certification levels that are given to septic systems by the National Science Foundation (NSF). The lowest is NSF 40 and the highest (produces R1 water) is NSF 350. Getting NSF certification is costly and time-consuming, so Envirocycle hired Dr. Roger Babcock from the University of Hawaii to test their unit and determine its equivalent NSF rating. Dr. Babcock said that it was equivalent to an NSF 40. The WWB, based on Dr. Babcock's study, agreed to accept Envirocycle ATUs at NSF 40.

However, Envirocycle began claiming that their ATUs were equivalent to an NSF 350 (and claimed that Dr. Babcock's study supported their assertion). In early January the WWB met with Dr. Babcock who reiterated that the Envirocycle is equivalent to an NSF 40.

While we don't have a good handle on the per-unit cost (using HWH's proposal), Mark mentioned that it would be more cost-effective for us to support the installation of actual NSF 40 units (we could swap more cesspools for our money compared to the more-expensive Envirocycle) or request swapping cesspools with certified NSF 350 units for the biggest impact on water quality at roughly the same cost as the current proposal.

Mike

Michael Burke  
Grants Management Specialist  
Polluted Runoff Control Program  
Clean Water Branch, Hawai'i State Department of Health

808/586-7773

808/586-4352 (Fax)

## Appendix 4

## RFP NO. CWB-PRC 14-01 EVALUATION CRITERIA WORKSHEET

Applicant: Hanalei Watershed Hui

Project Title: Cesspool Assessment/Replacement

Grant Funds Requested: \$467,203.88

Match Funds Provided: \$311,820.93

Total Project Cost: \$779,024.81 Reviewed By: Yin

125 Total Points

Each of the categories will be scored based upon how the proposal addresses priority implementation projects, the clarity and quality of the information provided, and how that information correlates with the water quality goals of the grant and the CWB's mission.

No.	Category	Points
1.	<b>Overview:</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Briefly describe the activities to be funded</li> <li>Show how the proposed project will address nonpoint source pollution</li> <li>Briefly explain how the proposed project will achieve water quality improvements</li> </ul>	<div>1 of 1</div> <div>1 of 2</div> <div>1 of 2</div>
Overview Subtotal:		3 of 5
Comments: BAFO: no further comments. Proposal: cannot quantify anticipated results given locations have not yet been identified. Does not commit to number of replacements, only "targets" and budgets for 27 replacements.		
2.	<b>Project Site Description:</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Include a description of the project area, land owners, land cover, physical features and other information</li> <li>Adequately explain why the location for the project was chosen</li> <li>Include a clear and legible map of the project area</li> </ul>	<div>1 of 1</div> <div>2 of 3</div> <div>1 of 1</div>
Project Site Description Subtotal:		4 of 5
Comments: BAFO: replacement sites still not selected. Proposal: unclear in map which properties would be targeted by the program.		
3.	<b>WBP or TMDL Implementation Plan Context:</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Identify the project listed in Section 1.3 or in an effective WBP on the island of Kauai</li> <li>&lt;OR&gt; Identify a specific proposed implementation project from a Table 1 WBP or TMDL Implementation Plan</li> <li>Adequately show that the proposed project is a priority per the respective WBP or TMDL Implementation Plan</li> </ul>	<div>8 of 10</div> <div>1 of 1</div> <div>4 of 5</div>
WBP or TMDL Implementation Plan Context Subtotal:		12 of 15
Comments: clearly identified as priority in WBP. Plan was specific to rental properties, requiring further assesment work for owner occupied. Proposal could have better illustrated the number of cesspools located within 750 feet of waterbody etc. The information exists, unclear why signif assess is still needed. Pre- assessment work is unnecessary. Any 15 in HT w/i 750 would implement goals of plan.		
4.	<b>Scope of Services:</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Provide a detailed scope of services that adequately identifies and outlines the proposed activities</li> <li>Adequately describe in detail all tasks that are necessary to complete the project</li> <li>Clearly link the proposed tasks or activities to the overall project purpose</li> <li>Adequately describe how the tasks will be planned, managed, monitored, and completed</li> <li>Identify appropriate project deliverables</li> <li>Address any permitting requirements, property access permissions, and other applicable bottlenecks</li> <li>If a continuation of an existing project, show past successes and link to the proposed follow-up project</li> </ul>	<div>3 of 5</div> <div>1 of 3</div> <div>7 of 8</div> <div>2 of 4</div> <div>1 of 2</div> <div>0 of 2</div> <div>0 of 1</div>
Scope of Services Subtotal:		14 of 25
Comments: BAFO: Project is improved by simplification of assessment process, however currently proposed "assessment" work needs to be clarified - what are the tasks exactly? No task for establishing financing mechanisms (how will the money move, what do "agreements" look like and by when do they need to be in place? Potential roadblock exists given the higher volume ECs have not been approved by DOH. Need to clarify before moving forward to fund this contract. Proposal: proposal needs to clarify additional steps necessary. Does not adequately describe the challenge/ ease of getting property owners on board. Proposal does not commit to number of replacements. Unclear what "conferences" will be attended, the audience of these confs etc. Is this necessary? SOS needs more detail if to be funded - interim steps to ensure project is on task. what happens if less than 27 units replaced?		
5.	Anticipated Outcomes:	

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Identify which pollutant(s) will be addressed</li><li>• Clearly explain how the proposed project will reduce the identified pollutants and improve water quality</li></ul>	2	of 3
		7	of 9

5.	<b>Anticipated Outcomes (Continued):</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Provide estimates of current loads and anticipated reductions as a result of project installation</li> <li>• Explain how load reduction estimates were calculated</li> <li>• Provide a detailed description of how the anticipated outcomes meet water quality goals per the respective WBP</li> </ul>	<div>3 of 5</div> <div>3 of 5</div> <div>2 of 3</div>
<b>Anticipated Outcomes Subtotal:</b>		<b>17</b> of 25
Comments: BAFO: still unclear. Does provide more details on the selection of the treatment units and anticipated benefits. Proposal: unclear if data exist to link cesspools to wq impairments/ pollutant loads. Proposal does good job of showing effectiveness to treatment method but falls short because the number of replacements is not committed. Because locations are not secured, difficult to assess the anticipated effectiveness of the implementations. proposal does not provide context of anticipated load reduction with the impairment of the watershed/ waterbody.		
6.	<b>Project Monitoring:</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Adequately describe the approach for monitoring pre- and post-project installation conditions</li> </ul>	<div>2 of 5</div>
<b>Effectiveness Monitoring Subtotal:</b>		<b>2</b> of 5
Comments: need to ID implementation milestones to ensure project on task. NTP lacks "landowner agreements" milestones. Unclear if the groundwater sampling is necessary - do we have information about contam of the groundwater? Proposal does not discuss relevance. assessment work not necessary.		
7.	<b>Education and Outreach:</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Briefly describe the strategy and activities planned to educate and involve the public</li> <li>• Are the strategies and activities listed adequate for successful public outreach?</li> </ul>	<div>3 of 5</div> <div>3 of 5</div>
<b>Education and Outreach Subtotal:</b>		<b>6</b> of 10
Comments: outreach and obtaining land owner agreements needs to be expanded.		
8.	<b>Personnel and Partners:</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Are the project manager and contact person identified and include relevant background information?</li> <li>• Identify key partners who will adequately assist in the successful completion of the activities proposed</li> <li>• Include contact information, as well as a brief statement, of the role or contribution of all partners</li> <li>• Include appropriate letters of support from partner organizations</li> </ul>	<div>1 of 2</div> <div>1 of 3</div> <div>2 of 3</div> <div>2 of 2</div>
<b>Personnel and Partners Subtotal:</b>		<b>6</b> of 10
Comments: BAFO: it still remains unclear how likely securing 15 land owner agreements really is given the financial burden. While the proposal include on the ground outreach, and technical expertise, the ability to communicate what could be complicated financial commitment is unclear. . Proposal: proposal should identify if there are contractors on island with the technical ability to install EC systems.		
9.	<b>Budget:</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Clearly delineate costs to be met by the grant and matching funds</li> <li>• Include clear descriptions of cost categories and provide sufficient justification for costs</li> </ul>	<div>6 of 10</div> <div>3 of 10</div>
<b>Budget Subtotal:</b>		<b>9</b> of 20
Comments: BAFO: BAFO provided more detail on contractors and costs associated with each step of the ATU design and installation. BAFO limits project to 15 replacements Proposal: unclear distribution of costs for EC units in budget - grant funds vs match. What is "investment" vs. Owner? How much does one EC cost? How much does installation/ construction contractor cost? What happens if less than 27 units are replaced? Are Envirocycles necessary? so much more beneficial than ATU? justification. Budget is not reasonable given unknown for number of units funded. need to better articulate the cost per property break down of cost (unit, engineering, installation etc).		
10.	<b>Schedule of Activities:</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Include a schedule of activities that adequately outlines all deliverables described in the Scope of Services</li> </ul>	<div>3 of 5</div>
<b>Schedule of Activities Subtotal:</b>		<b>3</b> of 5
Comments: BAFO: in order to move forward, the schedule must include specific milestones eg. 15 agreements by certain date - or project will be canceled - if 15 are not secured, the project will not achieve the benefits outlined in the proposal and therefore would not be competitive per this RFP. Proposal: steps missing. See comments above.		
<b>TOTAL SCORE:</b>		<b>76</b> of 125

Actual points awarded will follow these general ranges:

- Fully Addressed Criteria: 22-25 points for 25 point criteria; 18-20 points for 20; 9-10 points for 10; 9 points for 9; 5 points for 5

- Partially Addressed Criteria: 8-21 points for 25 point criteria; 6-17 points for 20; 3-8 points for 10; 3-8 points for 9; 2-4 points for 5
- Criteria Not Addressed: 0-7 points for 25 point criteria; 0-5 points for 20; 0-2 points for 10; 0-2 points for 9; 0-1 point for 5

From: Burke, Michael <Michael.Burke@doh.hawaii.gov>  
Sent: Tuesday, February 24, 2015 6:43 PM  
To: Iwashita, Darcey; Takeshima, Greg; Tubal, Randee  
Cc: Yin, Christina; Slay, Hudson  
Subject: BAFO Meetings 2/25

Everyone has responded and will participate in the BAFO conferences. I do not know if SRGII will attend in person (likely) or via conference call as well. I realized that I never sent all of you the original emails that I sent to the three applicants that listed the issues that we wanted to discuss with them, so I've included that in this email. Please keep in mind that it's not exclusive, and if I missed anything (or if something has come up since I sent them, like the Envirocycle Septic Systems) then we can still talk about it during the meeting:

Hui o Ko'olaupoko (Windward Community College LID) 11:00am (HST):

- The proposed project is relatively small (0.7 acres). We need more context in the proposal as to what this will accomplish. Is the sediment load coming from the Windward Community College (WCC) currently at 50 tons/year and installing the LID lot reduces that to 10? There needs to be a better explanation (and context) of the water quality benefits we'll achieve by funding this project.
- This isn't technically a Phase II project, as the WCC raingarden installation was part of your raingarden project. However, because it's titled as such, we need more detail about how successful Phase I was. This proposal should be a natural extension of Phase I, building upon Phase I's success.
- The monitoring costs are too expensive. With Hui o Ko'olaupoko's (HoK's) prior projects, plus assistance from our Environmental Health Specialist Greg Takeshima, developing a Monitoring Plan and QA/QC Plan should not cost anywhere near \$10,000. Why can't WCC also assist with project monitoring to reduce costs? We suggest looking at eliminating most, if not all, monitoring costs. The level of detail provided is unnecessary and overly expensive. Per the RFP, we would like pre- and post-construction project effectiveness monitoring. We do not ask for water quality monitoring from our contractors.
- The budget is overly detailed, but the budget justification is very thin. How were the costs determined? For example, the budget requests ten stone flumes at \$1000/each. But the drawing does not show where these flumes will be located, nor is there any explanation in the proposal itself. How did HoK decide that ten were necessary? Provide a better drawing, or a better explanation.
- Why is Horsley Witten's services all match?

Waipa Foundation (Watershed Projects) 1:00pm (HST):

- We would like to see some demonstration of Kamehameha Schools/Bishop Estate support. I would suggest starting now to obtain a letter of recommendation to include in your BAFO. The best would be some kind of financial commitment on KS/BE's part for match and to fully validate their support, or to assist with O&M in the future, but a letter supporting your efforts and promising to keep the BMPs intact irrespective of the Waipa Foundation's tenancy would be good.
- Your proposal was very close to not being included in the BAFO round because it lacks the required Budget Justification section. We need to know why you think you need the grant funds you ask for. Please be sure to include a robust budget justification section in your BAFO. Similarly, some of your match costs are out of line. A Kawasaki Mule should cost no more than \$10k new (including shipping to Kauai). Asking a daily rental rate that exceeds the cost of two brand-new Mules will not be allowed. Likewise, there needs to be a very good explanation as to why your native plants cost \$7.50/each when most nurseries charge less. What is the rent expense? Is this for the Waipa Foundation's lease?
- Cesspool Replacements: Removing three cesspools is good, but out of approximately how many in the Waipa Watershed? If these are the only three cesspools in the watershed, that's great. If there are fifty cesspools, then the water quality impact will not be as significant and we'd prefer to see a greater number of cesspool swaps than just three. We need context for the proposed BMP.
- Feral Ungulate Removal: Approximately how many pigs are in the watershed? How many do you intend to harvest? There is data available (the University of Hawaii did a study about feral pig impacts in upper Manoa several years ago) that you can use to really demonstrate that this BMP will produce effective results. Again, we need context.
- Constructed Wetland: Splitting the lo'i in two and having half planted native and the other half from volunteers, and then determining if the volunteer plantings are effective at reducing nonpoint source pollution is very close to being a research project. Keep in mind that 319(h) funds cannot be used for research.
- Operations & Maintenance: You mention that you included O&M costs during the project period in the proposed budget. It would be good to acknowledge an attempt to find and secure funding from other sources to continue O&M operations beyond this proposed project.
- Overall, there are occasions where the proposal makes broad statements (e.g., BMPs significantly improving water quality, etc.) that are not supported. We suggest that you provide supporting sentences or references to back up some of the overly broad claims. Ultimately, we're looking at the proposed project, how much it costs, what are the deliverables, and whether it improves water quality.

Use this as a filter in your BMP section, so that each proposed BMP meets what we're looking for. Also make sure that you include relevant context. As mentioned above, it's good that you're looking to replace cesspools. But swapping three doesn't tell us if that will make a significant impact on the number of cesspools in the watershed, or is just a drop in the bucket. Apply this thought process to all of your proposed BMPs.

Hanalei Watershed Hui (Cesspool Replacement) 2:15pm (HST):

- We would like the Hanalei Watershed Hui's (HWH's) proposal to commit to replacing fifteen cesspools. If this proposal is awarded and if the project is successful, we would be willing to look at funding opportunities to swap more cesspools in the future. For now, keep the number at fifteen.
- Based on swapping fifteen cesspools, what is the actual, per-unit cost? This includes planning and permit application, construction, and the Envirocycles and related equipment. Please include this number in the budget narrative.
- We do not support the assessment portion as proposed. We strongly feel that the HWH itself can provide outreach to the community to sign up fifteen interested parties in the Hanalei Watershed. If there are more than fifteen properties that commit to a cesspool swap, prioritizing using water usage can then be implemented. We will not fund any travel during the assessment portion without significant and convincing justification. Please update the budget, outreach, and scope of services sections accordingly.
- Who is installing the cesspool swaps? We would like the HWH to address the option of putting the construction work out to bid and hiring the lowest bidder.
- The Education and Outreach section needs to be revised. Putting information on a website, or filming and airing a public access television show, means nothing without context. How many hits does the HWH website receive per month? How many viewers for the television show? How will the proposed activities be effective?
- Who is HWH's Project Administrator and Outreach Specialist. Are these new hires? Or are you doing all three jobs?

Sorry if the formatting is dorked up; I'm emailing from home. Also Tina, I may need your technical help with patching in both Matt Rosener and Stacy Sproat for the second meeting since they will be on separate phone lines. I'll get you their numbers tomorrow. According to Matt, Stacy may have to leave the meeting early but has committed to being a part of the call to start.

Thanks,  
Mike

Yin, Christina

---

From: Polanco, Susan  
Sent: Wednesday, March 18, 2015 5:57 PM  
To: Yin, Christina; Slay, Hudson  
Subject: Comments: Hawaii NPS (319) Project Proposals Feedback requested by 3/19/15

Thanks for the chance to review this projects.

I quickly went through them and here are my thoughts:

1. Hanalei small cesspool closure – I like this idea and would like to see this system operational but I do see some issues:
  - a. The proposal says the homeowners are “volunteering to pay for this” well, has anyone calculated how much they have been saving by using a cesspool all these years vs. paying a sewer bill? What is the \$\$ contribution to each house per year for water quality impairment?
  - b. I did not see the letter of support attached from the community.
  - c. What type of an agreement and with whom for how long do these homeowners have to maintain the system? Will they create a HOA and pay monthly for maintenance? Does this become part of the deed of the home? If someone sells, what is their obligation to continue?
  - d. Who is reviewing their credit and what if they want to self-finance their portion? What is they stop paying? Will a lien be added to their home?
  - e. Is their a “lead” system manager for the system?
  - f. How long will they agree to run the system for this \$\$ grant amount? What is the life of the unit they are proposing?
2. Waipa
  - a. This looks fine, usual items but in a good areas.
3. WCC
  - a. A good large demo project for the school and UH system.

I think the Hanalei cesspool project is the most interesting and needed but they seem to need more answers for the fiscal solvency of the projects.

I like the WCC project because it will be successful and a good example for what can be done for a large scale retrofit.

The Waipa project seems very doable and necessary bur do we really need to pay for this routine work?

Thanks for the chance to comment. I am willing to discuss further if you would like.

Aloha,  
Susan

Susan Polanco de Couet  
HI SRF Project Officer  
[polanco.susan@epa.gov](mailto:polanco.susan@epa.gov)  
808.541.2722

---

From: Yin, Christina  
Sent: Monday, March 16, 2015 3:25 PM



To: R9-WTR-Aloha

Subject: Hawaii NPS (319) Project Proposals Feedback requested by 3/19/15

Aloha Workgroup – Per the RFP I distributed in December 2014, The Hawaii Polluted Runoff Control Program has narrowed the field of projects to 3 final proposals. Hudson and I are members of the review team and will each provide scores and comments for each project.

The review team (EPA and DOH) will discuss the projects and make a decision on which ones to fund (with 319 Project \$) this week. (yes, very fast turn around). We welcome input from the Aloha Workgroup. If you have time, and interest, please take a look at these proposals. We will try to incorporate your feedback/ thoughts into our reviews as appropriate.

Please give one of us a call or zip an email to us before 11 am Pacific time on Thursday March 19, 2015.

The full proposals are located here: G:\MISC\Aloha Workgroup\PRC\RFPs\Feb 2015\BAFOs

Below are quick snapshots of the 3 proposed projects:

1. Project: Replacing Small Capacity Cesspools with Advanced Wastewater Systems In Hanalei Bay  
Applicant: Hanalei Watershed Hui  
Watershed Plan: Hanalei Bay Watershed Management Plan  
Budget: Grant request \$467,203 + match \$311,820 = \$779,024 Total Project Cost
  - A. Develop and implement cesspool cost-share replacement program to reduce bacteria and and nutrients
  - B. Replace 15 total cesspools with "Envirocycle units" (advanced on site waste water systems) in Hanalei Town
    - a. 12 cesspools on owner occupied properties
    - b. 3 cesspools on rental properties
  - C. Monitoring at 2 sites (piezometers)
2. Project: Watershed Implementation Project for the Ahupua a of Waipa  
Applicant: The Waipa Foundation  
Watershed Plan: Hanalei Bay Watershed Management Plan  
Budget: Grant request \$386,291+ match \$111,791 = \$498,082 Total Project Cost
  - A. Replace 3 low-lying cesspools currently located within 300 feet of surface water (cost-share) (bacteria and nutrient reduction)
  - B. Feral ungulate removal from watershed via hunting and trapping (ecosystem improvement, sediment reduction)
  - C. Construct 500 sq ft "wetland" at taro lo i to reduce pollutants from taro patches
  - D. Install 600 linear feet livestock fencing and off stream watering facilities for 4 paddocks
  - E. Implement Taro Lo i BMPs, assess effectiveness and impact on taro production
  - F. Stream/ riparian restoration (2 acres), habitat enhancement and bank stabilization (requires 401 and 404)
  - G. Forested upland erosion control and re-vegetation on ~1 acre of hotspots (sediment reduction)
3. Project: Windward Community College Low-Impact Retrofit Phase II (Kane ohe)  
Applicant: Hui o Ko olaupoko  
Watershed Plan: Ko olaupoko Watershed Restoration Action Strategy (Kea ahala Watershed)  
Budget: Grant request \$186,016 + match \$46,900 = \$232,916 Total Project Cost
  - A. Retrofit existing 0.7 acre parking lot with LID approaches to capture, infiltrate and process polluted runoff
  - B. Conduct comprehensive project effectiveness monitoring
  - C. Education and outreach

Tina Yin, Regional Nonpoint Source Pollution Coordinator  
US EPA Region 9

75 Hawthorne Street, WTR 2-2  
San Francisco, CA 94105  
Phone: 415-972-3579  
[yin.christina@epa.gov](mailto:yin.christina@epa.gov)

Yin, Christina

---

From: Yin, Christina  
Sent: Tuesday, March 17, 2015 4:00 PM  
To: Wiltse, Wendy  
Subject: RE: Hawaii NPS (319) Project Proposals Feedback requested by 3/19/15

I think enough to almost cover all 3.

Tina Yin, Regional Nonpoint Source Pollution Coordinator  
US EPA Region 9  
75 Hawthorne Street, WTR 2-2  
San Francisco, CA 94105  
Phone: 415-972-3579  
[yin.christina@epa.gov](mailto:yin.christina@epa.gov)

---

From: Wiltse, Wendy  
Sent: Tuesday, March 17, 2015 1:37 PM  
To: Yin, Christina  
Subject: RE: Hawaii NPS (319) Project Proposals Feedback requested by 3/19/15

Tina these all sound good. How much money do they have?  
Wendy

EPA Region 9 - PICO  
300 Ala Moana Blvd. Box 50003  
Room 5-152  
Honolulu, HI 96734  
Ph: 808-541-2752  
FAX: 808-541-2712  
[wiltse.wendy@epa.gov](mailto:wiltse.wendy@epa.gov)

---

From: Yin, Christina  
Sent: Monday, March 16, 2015 3:25 PM  
To: R9-WTR-Aloha  
Subject: Hawaii NPS (319) Project Proposals Feedback requested by 3/19/15

Aloha Workgroup – Per the RFP I distributed in December 2014, The Hawaii Polluted Runoff Control Program has narrowed the field of projects to 3 final proposals. Hudson and I are members of the review team and will each provide scores and comments for each project.

The review team (EPA and DOH) will discuss the projects and make a decision on which ones to fund (with 319 Project \$) this week. (yes, very fast turn around). We welcome input from the Aloha Workgroup. If you have time, and interest, please take a look at these proposals. We will try to incorporate your feedback/ thoughts into our reviews as appropriate.

Please give one of us a call or zip an email to us before 11 am Pacific time on Thursday March 19, 2015.

The full proposals are located here: G:\MISC\Aloha Workgroup\PRC\RFPs\Feb 2015\BAFOs  
Below are quick snapshots of the 3 proposed projects:

1. Project: Replacing Small Capacity Cesspools with Advanced Wastewater Systems In Hanalei Bay  
Applicant: Hanalei Watershed Hui  
Watershed Plan: Hanalei Bay Watershed Management Plan  
Budget: Grant request \$467,203 + match \$311,820 = \$779,024 Total Project Cost
  - A. Develop and implement cesspool cost-share replacement program to reduce bacteria and and nutrients
  - B. Replace 15 total cesspools with "Envirocycle units" (advanced on site waste water systems) in Hanalei Town
    - a. 12 cesspools on owner occupied properties
    - b. 3 cesspools on rental properties
  - C. Monitoring at 2 sites (piezometers)
2. Project: Watershed Implementation Project for the Ahupua a of Waipa  
Applicant: The Waipa Foundation  
Watershed Plan: Hanalei Bay Watershed Management Plan  
Budget: Grant request \$386,291+ match \$111,791 = \$498,082 Total Project Cost
  - A. Replace 3 low-lying cesspools currently located within 300 feet of surface water (cost-share) (bacteria and nutrient reduction)
  - B. Feral ungulate removal from watershed via hunting and trapping (ecosystem improvement, sediment reduction)
  - C. Construct 500 sq ft "wetland" at taro lo i to reduce pollutants from taro patches
  - D. Install 600 linear feet livestock fencing and off stream watering facilities for 4 paddocks
  - E. Implement Taro Lo i BMPs, assess effectiveness and impact on taro production
  - F. Stream/ riparian restoration (2 acres), habitat enhancement and bank stabilization (requires 401 and 404)
  - G. Forested upland erosion control and re-vegetation on ~1 acre of hotspots (sediment reduction)
3. Project: Windward Community College Low-Impact Retrofit Phase II (Kane ohe)  
Applicant: Hui o Ko olaupoko  
Watershed Plan: Ko olaupoko Watershed Restoration Action Strategy (Kea ahala Watershed)  
Budget: Grant request \$186,016 + match \$46,900 = \$232,916 Total Project Cost
  - A. Retrofit existing 0.7 acre parking lot with LID approaches to capture, infiltrate and process polluted runoff
  - B. Conduct comprehensive project effectiveness monitoring
  - C. Education and outreach

Tina Yin, Regional Nonpoint Source Pollution Coordinator  
US EPA Region 9  
75 Hawthorne Street, WTR 2-2  
San Francisco, CA 94105  
Phone: 415-972-3579  
[yin.christina@epa.gov](mailto:yin.christina@epa.gov)